

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **29 June 2005** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-27. Claim 2 was objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Saleh et al. (USPub 2001/0033548, hereinafter "Saleh").

Objections to the claims

Claim 2 was objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended claims 2 and 11 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 were rejected as being anticipated by Saleh. Applicant respectfully points out that Saleh teaches **exchanging special hello packets** created by an intermediate node and including a link state advertisement (LSA) message between adjacent nodes to establish to establish a complete topology of the network for the node (see Saleh, page 6, paragraph [0076]).

In contrast, the present invention examines **normal data packets** enroute from a source to a destination to determine if the packets have already been seen, and sends data packets that have not been previously seen to all adjacent nodes except the node from which the data packet was received (see FIG. 3, page 6, lines 16-21, and page 8, line 21 to page 10, line 8 of the instant application). This is beneficial because it precludes exchanging special messages between adjacent nodes and precludes requiring a node to learn the network topology. There is nothing within Saleh, either explicit or implicit, which suggests examining normal data packets enroute from a source to a destination to determine if the packets have already been seen and sending data packets that have not been previously

seen to all adjacent nodes except the node from which the data packet was received.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 to clarify that the present invention examines normal data packets enroute from a source to a destination to determine if the packets have already been seen, and sends data packets that have not been previously seen to all adjacent nodes except the node from which the data packet was received. These amendments find support in FIG. 3, in page 6, lines 16-21, and in page 8, line 21 to page 10, line 8 of the instant application. Dependent claims 2-8, 11-17, and 20-26 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 19 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-9, which depend upon claim 1, claims 11-18, which depend upon claim 10, and claims 20-27, which depend upon claim 19, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 18 July 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665